



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

62

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/914,932	10/29/2001	Helmut Heinz	4231/PCT	5970

21553 7590 02/03/2004

FASSE PATENT ATTORNEYS, P.A.
P.O. BOX 726
HAMPDEN, ME 04444-0726

EXAMINER

EDMONDSON, LYNNE RENEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/914,932

Applicant(s)

HEINZ ET AL.

Examiner

Lynne Edmondson

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/29/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1 . 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 7 and 9-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2, 8, 10 and 11 of copending Application No. 10/466031. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both teach method of producing circuit arrangements wherein components are attached to the top of a carrier body (support body, '031 claims) having thermal through contacts (thermal vias, '031 claims) which are closed by screen printing a material into the holes. Both teach first and second metallizing layers. Both teach curing of the screen-printed material after which protrusions are removed. See instant claim 1 and '031 claim 2. Both teach reflow soldering (instant claim 9, '031 claim 8). Both teach an insulating film applied to the bottom of the body (instant claim 10, '031 claim 10). Both teach a cooling body in connection with the insulating film (instant claim 11, '031 claim 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the methods are essentially the same except for the step of applying and removing a passivation layer and will result in a similar structure. Circuit structures with passivation layers are conventional in the art.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Isaacs et al. (USPN 5275330).

Isaacs teaches a method of producing a circuit arrangement wherein components are attached to the top surface of a carrier body (10) having thermal through contacts (16) and two metallization layers (20, 22 col 5 lines 4-14) wherein the contacts are closed with screen printed material (31) by a screen printing process prior to soldering (figure 8, col 5 line 41 – col 6 line 50). Cleaning is performed whenever necessary (col 4 lines 8-15, col 6 lines 51-64 and claim 5). Components are attached by reflow (col 5 lines 48-52). See also Isaacs claims 1, 4, 6-9 and 11.

Art Unit: 1725

5. Claims 1 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumar et al. (USPN 4493856).

Kumar teaches a method of producing a circuit arrangement wherein components are attached to the top surface of a carrier body (1) having thermal through contacts (4) and two metallization layers (col 3 lines 18-40 and col 5 line 30 – col 6 line 15) wherein the contacts are closed with screen printed material (3) by a screen printing process prior to soldering (figure 5, col 2 lines 36-51 and col 5 lines 47-61). Following curing of the screen-printed material, excess material is cleaned mechanically with a brush (col 6 lines 31-38). Components are attached by reflow (col 3 lines 18-40). See also Kumar claims 1 and 9-11

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Khandros et al. (USPN 6433419 B2, heat sink attached to metal layer), Mowatt et al. (USPN 6400573, heat sink) and Freyman et al. (USPN 4700473).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynne Edmondson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1172. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

Lynne Edmondson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1725

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lynne Edmondson', followed by a date '1/28/04'.

LRE